UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/734,440	12/11/2003	12/11/2003 Hemanth Sampath		4615	
²⁶²⁰⁰ FISH & RICH <i>A</i>	7590 03/19/200 ARDSON P.C.	EXAMINER			
P.O BOX 1022		HOM, SHICK C			
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2416		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/19/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/734,440	SAMPATH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHICK C. HOM	2416		

SHICK	. C. HOM	2416	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on t	the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	ATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sam application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 periods:	 an amendment, affidavit appeal fee) in compliance v 	, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of t	the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than	action, or (2) the date set forth i SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	• •		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension ar under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thre may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance w	ith 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS	ereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior	to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or	for appeal by materially red	ucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspo	nding number of finally reie	cted claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 4			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable in non-allowable claim(s). 	if submitted in a separate, t	mely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will n how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided bel The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficie was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and wa	e <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the state of th			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	IOT place the application in	andition for allower	b
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N	OT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SE13. ☐ Other:	3/08) Paper No(s)		
/Chi H Pham/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416 3/16/09			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: applicant's argument in pages 16-17 and 20-27 of the remarks that the use of bit errors in Mahany is not the same as the use packet loss indicators in the claim because bit errors are correctable whereas packet loss is only correctable with retransmission is not persuasive because Mahany in col 19 line 59 to col. 20 line 8 suggests and recites that bit errors indicate a communication failure has occurred and revert to a lower baud transmission and a retry clearly reads on the packet loss indicator claimed; applicant's argument in pages 18-19 that Mahany does not teach or suggest selecting a third different data rate is not persuasive because Mahany in col. 2 lines 35-57 recite the capability of switching between two or more data rates clearly reads on a third different data rate as claimed; in light of the amend and argument in pages 19-20 with respect to depend claim 5 raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search; further, claim 1 which is amend to recite merely a device in the preamble of the claim do not appear to identify the apparatus nor positively recite matter subject transformed as required in the 101 rejection.